Contact Person: James P. Harwood, Ph.D., Scientific Review Administrator, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5168, MSC 7840, Bethesda, MD 20892. 301–435– 1256. harwoodj@csr.nih.gov.

Name of Committee: Cell Biology Integrated Review Group, Biology and Diseases of the Posterior Eye.

Date: June 19–20, 2006.

Time: 8 a.m. 5:30 p.m. Agenda: To review and evaluate grant applications.

Place: Hyatt Regency Bethesda, One Bethesda Metro Center, 7400 Wisconsin Avenue, Bethesda, MD 20814.

Contact Person: Michael H. Chaitin, Ph.D., Scientific Review Administrator, Center for Scientific Review, National Institutes of Health, 6701 Rockledge Drive, Room 5202, MSC 7850, Bethesda, MD 20892. (301) 435–0910. chaitinm@csr.nih.gov.

(Catalogue of Federal Domestic Assistance Program Nos. 93.306, Comparative Medicine; 93.333, Clinical Research, 93.306, 93.333, 93.337, 93.393–93.396, 93.837–93.844, 93.846–93.878, 93.892, 93.893, National Institutes of Health, HHS)

Dated: April 27, 2006.

### David Clary,

Acting Director, Office of Federal Advisory Committee Policy.

[FR Doc. 06–4215 Filed 5–4–06; 8:45am]

BILLING CODE 4140-01-M

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

#### **Coast Guard**

[USCG-2006-24627]

Finding of No Significant Impact for the Installation and Operation of the Integrated Anti-Swimmer System

**AGENCY:** Coast Guard, DHS. **ACTION:** Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) is issuing this notice to advise the public that it has issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Installation and Operation of the Integrated Anti-Swimmer System, effective 4 April 2006, for the Final Environmental Assessment that evaluated the proposed action. This notice is issued in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. 4371 et seq.) and its implementing regulations 40 CFR 1500 through 1508.

**ADDRESSES:** Copies of the FONSI are available for review at the following locations and by the following methods:

(1) Electronic request to Mr. Kenneth McDaniel at

KMcdaniel@comdt.uscg.mil.

(2) Delivery request to Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Office of Security and Defense Operations (G–RPD), 2100 Second St., SW., Rm. 3121, Washington, DC 20593, Attn: K. McDaniel.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Commandant, United States Coast Guard, Office of Security and Defense Operations (G—RPD), 2100 Second St., SW., Rm. 3121, Washington, DC 20593, Attn: K. McDaniel.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The USCG has completed and issued its Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Installation and Operation of the Integrated Anti-Swimmer System (IAS). The FONSI sets out the USCG's consideration of environmental and other factors and is based on the Final Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the Installation and Operation of the IAS. The FONSI records the USCG's determination that the Proposed Action has no significant impact on the environment. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement is not necessary.

The PEA and FONSI were prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Section 102(2)(c)) and its implementing regulations at Title 40 Code of Federal Regulations, Parts 1500 through 1508. The Coast Guard evaluated the environmental and socioeconomic impacts of the Proposed Action in the PEA.

The PEA presents the purpose and need for the project, identifies and examines reasonable alternatives and assesses their potential impact to the environment. The PEA's analysis of alternatives to the proposed project includes the No-Action Alternative and assesses potential impacts associated with the proposed installation and operation of the IAS.

Mitigation measures intended to minimize potential environmental impacts are identified in the FONSI and would become part of the IAS training and deployment standard operating procedures. There are no environmental impacts associated with the preferred alternative that cannot be mitigated below significance thresholds described in the PEA.

Dated: May 1, 2006.

### S.M. Burke,

Commander, U.S. Coast Guard, Deputy Chief, Office of Security and Defense Operations. [FR Doc. E6–6874 Filed 5–4–06; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4910-15-P

# DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY

# U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services

Agency Information Collection Activities: Extension of an Existing Information Collection; Comment Request

**ACTION:** 30-day notice of information collection under review: Application for Naturalization; Form N–400. OMB Control No. 1615–0052.

The Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services (USCIS) has submitted the following information collection request to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and clearance in accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995. The information collection was previously published in the **Federal Register** on February 28, 2006, at 71 FR 10047. The notice allowed for a 60-day public comment period. No public comments were received on this information collection.

The purpose of this notice is to allow an additional 30 days for public comments. Comments are encouraged and will be accepted until June 5, 2006. This process is conducted in accordance with 5 CFR 1320.10.

Written comments and/or suggestions regarding the item(s) contained in this notice, especially regarding the estimated public burden and associated response time, should be directed to the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), USCIS, Director, Regulatory Management Division, Clearance Office, 111 Massachusetts Avenue, 3rd floor, Washington, DC 20529. Comments may also be submitted to DHS via facsimile to 202-272-8352 or via e-mail at rfs.regs@dhs.gov. When submitting comments by e-mail please make sure to add OMB Control No. 1615-0052 in the subject box. Written comments and suggestions from the public and affected agencies should address one or more of the following four points:

(1) Evaluate whether the proposed collection of information is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information will have practical utility:

(2) Evaluate the accuracy of the agencies estimate of the burden of the proposed collection of information, including the validity of the methodology and assumptions used;

(3) Enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and